PALGO JOURNAL OF EDUCATION RESEARCH (PJER)
http://www.palgojournals.org/PJER/Index.htm

# REVIEWERS GUIDE

**PART A:** ***Editorial Office Only***

**SECTION I**

## PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Manuscript Title:** Utilization of Assistive Technologies by Visually Impaired Students for Effective Information Access in Selected Federal University Libraries in South-South, Nigeria

**Reviewer's Recommendation:** Minor Revisions Required

---

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT**

This manuscript addresses an important and timely topic regarding accessibility in Nigerian university libraries. The research provides valuable insights into the state of assistive technologies for visually impaired students in the South-South region. The study demonstrates commendable effort in data collection through multiple methods and presents findings that have practical implications for library management and policy development.

---

**RATING SCALE: 1 = Excellent | 2 = Good | 3 = Fair | 4 = Poor**

**Originality:** 2 (Good)
**Contribution to the Field:** 2 (Good)
**Technical Quality:** 2 (Good)
**Clarity of Presentation:** 3 (Fair)
**Depth of Research:** 2 (Good)

---

**DETAILED COMMENTS**

### 1. GENERAL COMMENTS

**Strengths:**

- The research addresses a significant gap in understanding assistive technology utilization in Nigerian academic libraries
- The mixed-methods approach using FGD, interviews, and observation provides rich, triangulated data
- The inclusion of both user and staff perspectives strengthens the findings
- The practical recommendations are well-grounded in the research findings

**Areas for Improvement:**

- The manuscript would benefit from structural reorganization to improve flow and readability
- Some sections contain repetitive information that could be condensed
- The presentation could be more concise while maintaining depth
- Language and grammatical improvements are needed throughout

---

## 2. ABSTRACT

**Strengths:**

- Comprehensive coverage of the study's scope
- Clear statement of methodology

**Suggestions for Improvement:**

- The abstract is quite lengthy (approximately 400+ words). Consider reducing to 250-300 words
- Focus on the most significant findings rather than listing all aspects
- Add specific numerical results where possible (e.g., "UNICAL demonstrated 73% availability of ICT-based ATs")
- Consider restructuring to follow: Background (1-2 sentences) → Objective → Method → Key Findings → Conclusion

**Specific Corrections:**

→ "Two specific objectives and corresponding research questions were formulated" ← *Change to:* "The study addressed three specific research questions"

→ "thematically on the narratives" ← *Change to:* "thematically to analyze the narratives"

→ "106 visually impaired users attended the FGD session" ← *Change to:* "106 visually impaired users participated in FGD sessions"

---

## 3. INTRODUCTION

**Strengths:**

- Comprehensive background on university libraries and their role
- Good contextualization of assistive technologies
- Detailed explanation of different types of assistive technologies

**Suggestions for Improvement:**

- The introduction is quite extensive and could be more focused
- Consider moving the detailed list of assistive technologies to a separate section or table
- Strengthen the literature review by discussing recent studies on AT utilization
- Clarify the research gap more explicitly

**Specific Corrections:**

→ "An academic library is described as a library or library scheme set up managed and financed" ← *Insert commas:* "set up, managed, and financed"

→ "University libraries were proven to meet up with" ← *Change to:* "University libraries strive to meet"

→ "In recent times, new technologies and communication tools have revolutionized" ← *Be more specific:* "Over the past two decades, digital technologies have transformed"

→ "Effective means to work well" ← *Change to:* "Effective means working well"

→ "More so, it will enable them" ← *Change to:* "Moreover, it enables them"

→ "Assistive technologies are otherwise known as adaptive technologies" ← *Rephrase:* "Assistive technologies (ATs), also known as adaptive technologies,"

→ "Utilization is the state of having been made use of" ← *Simplify:* "Utilization refers to the active use of"

→ "According to Nigerian national Policy on Education (2014)" ← *Capitalize properly:* "According to Nigeria's National Policy on Education (2014)"

---

## 4. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

**Suggestions for Improvement:**

- This section is too brief and lacks depth
- Expand to clearly articulate the problem, its scope, and significance
- Provide evidence or statistics supporting the problem statement

**Specific Corrections:**

→ "This condition can cause them to record or experience poor academic performance" ← *Simplify:* "This condition may result in poor academic performance"

→ "Invariably it would be against the objectives of information ethics which the librarians have sworn to protect and oblige to" ← *Rephrase for clarity:* "This situation contradicts the information ethics principles that librarians are committed to upholding"

---

## 5. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY & RESEARCH QUESTIONS

**Strengths:**

- Clear alignment between objectives and research questions

**Suggestions for Improvement:**

- Consider adding a research question on challenges/barriers to AT utilization
- The objectives section mentions topics not reflected in the research questions (competencies, strategies)

**Specific Corrections:**

→ "adaptive technology" ← *Be consistent:* Use "assistive technologies (ATs)" or "adaptive technologies" consistently throughout (I recommend "assistive technologies")

→ "south south" ← *Capitalize:* "South-South"

---

## 6. METHODOLOGY

**Strengths:**

- Clear description of population and sampling
- Good justification for purposive sampling
- Multiple data collection methods enhance validity

**Suggestions for Improvement:**

- Add information about ethical considerations and informed consent
- Clarify the validation process for instruments more clearly
- Explain how the assistant moderator was trained
- Provide more detail on the thematic analysis process

**Specific Corrections:**

→ "The population of the study is 205" ← *Use past tense:* "was"

→ "Focus group discussion sessions, Interview schedules and an observation checklist were the instruments" ← *Remove capitalization:* "interview schedules"

→ "which were faced validated by three experts" ← *Correct typo:* "face-validated" or "content-validated"

→ "tables with percentages (%) were used to analyze" ← *Change to:* "frequencies and percentages were used to analyze"

→ "The visually impaired students from the nominal roll in the four university libraries are as follows:" ← *Use past tense:* "were"

→ "that will not be among the discussion group but will be personally interviewed" ← *Use past tense:* "were not included in the discussion groups but were personally interviewed"

→ "Therefore, no sampling was done" ← *This contradicts the earlier statement about purposive sampling. Clarify:* "A census approach was used for library staff, while purposive sampling was employed for student participants"

→ "The observation checklist consists of 24 items which were used" ← *Use past tense:* "consisted"

→ "that exploredthe adaptive technologies" ← *Add space:* "explored the"

---

## 7. RESULTS PRESENTATION

**Strengths:**

- Clear tables showing availability of ATs across universities
- Good use of percentages for comparison

**Suggestions for Improvement:**

- The data analysis table with themes, categories, and subcategories needs better formatting
- Consider presenting key quotes from FGD participants to illustrate findings
- The observation checklist results table is well-structured but could benefit from visual enhancement (consider adding a summary graph)
- Research Question 1 results are presented clearly, but narrative findings for RQ2 and RQ3 are missing from the document excerpt

**Specific Corrections:**

→ Table formatting: Ensure consistent alignment and spacing in all tables

→ "Freq" ← *Write out:* "Frequency" in the key

---

## 8. DISCUSSION

**Note:** The discussion section appears to be integrated with findings. Consider separating these for clarity.

**Suggestions for Improvement:**

- Develop a distinct discussion section that:
    - Interprets findings in relation to existing literature
    - Explains unexpected results
    - Discusses theoretical and practical implications
    - Acknowledges limitations of the study

---

## 9. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

**Strengths:**

- Thoughtful consideration of practical implications

**Specific Corrections:**

→ "those that are exposed" ← *Change to:* "those who are exposed"

→ "because of the inability of their institution to provide for their use" ← *Rephrase:* "due to their institutions' inability to provide these resources"

→ "independents in browsing" ← *Change to:* "independent when browsing"

→ "all these is made possible" ← *Correct agreement:* "all this is made possible"

→ "infringed upon, leaving them to fend for themselves means they are not regarded" ← *Rephrase for clarity:* "infringed upon. This situation forces them to be self-reliant, suggesting they are undervalued"

## 10. RECOMMENDATIONS

**Strengths:**

- Practical and actionable recommendations
- Well-grounded in the research findings

**Specific Corrections:**

→ "Government should increase funding" ← *Be more specific:* "Federal and state governments should increase dedicated funding"

→ "which is 10% of the university's annual budget should be adhered to" ← *Remove backslash and rephrase:* "which represents 10% of the university's annual budget, should be enforced"

→ "More university library staff should be trained as more hands are needed" ← *Rephrase to avoid redundancy:* "Additional university library staff should be recruited and trained"

---

## 11. CONCLUSION

**Strengths:**

- Comprehensive summary of major findings

**Suggestions for Improvement:**

- More concise presentation
- Avoid introducing new information in the conclusion

**Specific Corrections:**

→ "First, it is established that visually impaired users are technology savvy" ← *Consider rephrasing:* "First, the study establishes that visually impaired users demonstrate technological competence"

→ "their utilization of ATs is at optimum but is limited" ← *This is contradictory. Rephrase:* "their utilization of ATs could be optimized if not for limitations such as"

→ "because of their scarcity in the markets" ← *Change to:* "due to their limited commercial availability"

---

## 12. REFERENCES

**Suggestions for Improvement:**

- Follow a consistent citation style (appears to be APA; ensure complete compliance)
- Some references need formatting corrections
- Verify all URLs are functional
- Consider adding more recent references (post-2015)

**Specific Corrections:**

→ "Nwezeh, C., & Shabi, I. (2011)" ← *Journal title formatting:* Italicize journal name

→ URLs should be formatted consistently, some use underlines while others don't

→ "Retrieved [date] from" ← *Current APA 7 doesn't require retrieval dates for most sources; update to current APA format*

→ Check all author names for consistency (e.g., "Hiesh" should be verified - possibly "Hsieh")

---

**TECHNICAL ISSUES TO ADDRESS**

### Language and Grammar Patterns to Review:

1. **Subject-verb agreement issues** throughout (e.g., "all these is" should be "all this is")
2. **Tense consistency**: Switch between past and present tense; use past tense for completed research
3. **Article usage**: Several instances of missing or incorrect articles (a, an, the)
4. **Word choice**: Some informal expressions need academic alternatives
5. **Sentence structure**: Some sentences are overly long and complex; break into shorter, clearer sentences

### Formatting Consistency Needed:

- Heading capitalization styles vary
- Table formatting needs standardization
- Spacing inconsistencies throughout
- Abbreviation use (define on first use, then use consistently)

---

**SPECIFIC QUESTIONS FOR AUTHORS**

1. Can you provide the specific narratives/quotes from FGD participants that support your thematic findings?
2. What were the interrater reliability measures for your qualitative coding?
3. How did you address potential researcher bias in data collection and analysis?
4. Can you clarify the discrepancy between "no sampling was done" and the use of "purposive sampling"?
5. Were there any ethical approval processes followed? This should be stated.

---

**RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY**

**Decision: Accept with Minor Revisions**

This manuscript makes a valuable contribution to understanding assistive technology utilization in Nigerian university libraries. The research is methodologically sound and provides practical insights for library administrators and policymakers. However, revisions are needed to:

1. Improve language clarity and correct grammatical errors throughout
2. Enhance structural organization and reduce repetition
3. Strengthen the discussion by better connecting findings to existing literature
4. Address the specific corrections noted above
5. Add missing methodological details (ethics, validation processes)
6. Update and standardize references

With these revisions, this manuscript will be suitable for publication and will contribute meaningfully to the literature on inclusive library services in developing countries.